

### REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of April 18, 2007. The Office Action indicated that Claims 20-36 are pending, Claims 20-23, 28-20 and 32-35 are rejected, and Claims 24-27, 31 and 36 are objected to. With this Amendment, Claims 20, 25-28, 32, 36 are amended, Claims 23, 24, 31 are cancelled, and Claims 20-22, 25-30, 32-36 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 20-23, 28 and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Repperger (U.S. Patent No. 5,101,472).

With this Amendment, Claim 20 is amended to include the limitations of Claim 24, which was indicated to be allowable, and intervening Claim 23. Claims 23 and 24 are cancelled. Claims 20-22 are thus believed to be in allowable form. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 20-22 are therefore requested.

With this Amendment, Claim 28 is amended to include the limitations of Claim 31 which was indicated to be allowable. Claim 31 is cancelled. Claims 28 is thus believed to be in allowable form. Reconsideration and allowance of Claim 28 is therefore requested.

With this Amendment, method Claim 32 is amended to include method limitations having subject matter similar to that indicated as being allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of method Claims 32-34 are therefore requested.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Repperger '472. Claims 29 and 30 depend from Claim 28 which is amended, as discussed above, to include limitations of allowable Claim 31. Claims 29 and 30 include limitations that, when taken in combination with the limitations of the currently amended base Claim 28, are also believed to be patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 29 and 30 are therefore requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an example of instructions that can be used to achieve updated parameter data. A set of instructions used to achieve updated parameter data is set forth in the form of an equation at reference 307 of FIG. 6 of applicant's disclosure. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 35 and allowance of Claim 35 is therefore requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 24-27, 31 and 36 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The limitations of objected-to Claims 24, 31 have been included in the respective base claims 20, 28, and Claims 24, 31 are cancelled.

As discussed above, the rejection of base Claim 35 under 35 USC 112 has been overcome and Claim 35 is allowable. Allowable Claim 36 now depends from allowable Claim 35 and is believed to be in allowable form. Reconsideration and Allowance of Claim 36 is therefore requested.

Conclusion

With this Amendment, the application appears to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /David D. Brush/  
David D Brush, Reg. No. 34,557  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222  
Fax: (612) 334-3312

DCB/elk